

enthusiasm for resurrecting an epithet that has not been used for over 200 years. The third option would reverse what has become established usage during the last 28 years, and would be destabilising. The second option is disagreeable, as it means conserving a name that was resurrected by Laundon for purely nomenclatural reasons, but which would not have been taken up if the matter had been investigated more thoroughly, but I feel that I have little choice but to take that route.

If this conservation proposal is not accepted, we will be left with only option 1, unless a further proposal is made to conserve or to reject one or more names.

Acknowledgment

Thanks, as usual, to John McNeill for helpful improvements to the manuscript.

(2073) Proposal to conserve the name *Pseudiris* Chukr & A. Gil against *Pseudo-iris* Medik. (*Iridaceae*), or to conserve *Limniris* against *Pseudo-iris*

Manuel B. Crespo & M^a Ángeles Alonso

CIBIO, Instituto de la Biodiversidad, Universidad de Alicante, P.O. Box 99, 03080 Alicante, Spain

Author for correspondence: Manuel B. Crespo, crespo@ua.es

- (2073) *Pseudiris* Chukr & A. Gil in Proc. Calif. Acad. Sci. 59: 725. 30 Dec 2008 [*Monocot.: Irid.*], nom. cons. prop.
 Typus: *P. speciosa* Chukr & A. Gil
- (H) *Pseudo-iris* Medik. in Hist. & Commentat. Acad. Elect. Sci. Theod.-Palat. 6: 417. Apr-Jun 1790, nom. rej. prop.
 Typus: *P. palustris* Medik., nom. illeg. (*Iris pseudacorus* L.)

Pseudo-iris was described by Medikus (l.c.) to accommodate *Iris pseudacorus* L. The name was attributed to Dodonaeus (Stirp. Hist. Pempt.: 248. 1583) as was the one species name, and the genus was clearly differentiated from other related iris groups that were also accepted at generic rank, such as *Iris* L., *Xiphion* Mill. (*Iris* subg. *Xiphion* (Mill.) Spach) and *Chamaeiris* Medik. (*I.* subg. *Xyridion* (Tausch) Spach). *Pseudo-iris* Medik. was apparently entirely neglected from the time of its publication. Mention was occasionally made in the synonymy of *I. pseudacorus* (*I. lutea* Lam.) of Dodonaeus's pre-Linnaean usage of the name (Candolle in Redouté, Liliac. 4: t. 235. 1808; Savi, Bot. Etrusc. 2: 11. 1815; Smith, Engl. Fl. 1: 48–49. 1824), but not of Medikus's valid publication of it. Later monographers such as Klatt (in Linnaea 34: 609–610. 1866), Baker (Handb. Irid.: 11–12. 1892), Lynch (Book of the Iris: 76–77. 1904), Dykes (Gen. Iris: 76–79. 1913), Mathew (Iris: 104, 215. 1983), and Rodionenko (Rod Iris: 186. 1987 [English translation]), made no mention at all of *Pseudo-iris*. Consequently, it has not been referred to in recent works (cf. Brummitt, Vasc. Pl. Fam. Gen.: 352–357. 1992; Mabberley, Plant Book, ed. 3: 708. 2008; Goldblatt & Manning, Iris Family: 200–204, 287. 2008). It is, however, included in at least three current general databases: Euro+Med Plantbase (<http://ww2.bgbm.org/EuroPlusMed/PTaxonDetail.asp?NameId=17163&PTRefFk=8000000>), Tropicos (<http://www.tropicos.org/Name/40017924>), and Kew: World checklist of selected plant families (http://apps.kew.org/wcsp/namedetail.do?sessionid=61C79C355BB7BE56F2A3C7BDA8327F83?name_id=324303). Its priority had been mentioned by Nevski (in Trudy Bot. Inst. Akad. Nauk. S.S.S.R., Ser. 1, Fl. Sist. Vyssh. Rast. 4: 331. 1937), and has also been noted recently by Mavrodiev (in Shmakov, A.I. (ed.), Probl. Bot. S. Siberia Mongolia, Proc. 9th Int. Sci. Pract. Conf.: 148–155. 2010—http://ssbg.asu.ru/trudi/problemi_bot_9_2010.pdf) in a general discussion on the classification of *Iris* and its segregate genera. Mavrodiev, however, adopted the name *Limniris* subg. *Limniris* for the monophyletic group that he called “clade *Pseudo-iris*”.

However, as a validly published name under the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006), *Pseudo-iris* must be taken into account when it competes with names of lesser priority. If *Pseudo-iris* is accepted at the genus rank, it has priority and hence challenges *Limniris* (Tausch) Rchb. 1841 and most probably *Pseudiris* Chukr & A. Gil. 2008, as shown below.

The name *Pseudiris* (l.c.) has been recently proposed for a remarkable plant of tribe *Trimezieae*, which grows in the state of Bahia (NE of Brazil). Despite belonging to that tribe, its overall floral morphology resembles that of certain species of *Iris*, this being the origin of the genus name. Although recently described, it has already been accepted by Govaerts (WCSP: World Checklist of Selected Plant Families. 2010), and has been used by Gil & al. (in Harvard Pap. Bot. 14(2): 97–99. 2009) and Lovo & Mello-Silva (in Brittonia 63(4): 457–460. 2011). It is our view that *Pseudiris* must be treated as a later homonym of *Pseudo-iris* under Art. 53.3, since both names are sufficiently alike to be confused and they are applied to taxa of the same subfamily (*Iridoideae*, *Iridaceae*) and are based on different types.

Limniris (Tausch) Rchb., Deut. Bot. Herb.-Buch: 43. 1841 (*Iris* subg. *Limniris* (Tausch) Spach as restricted by Wilson in Taxon 60: 27–35. 2011—her “*Limniris* I”) is applied to irises with rhizomatose rootstock, unifacial leaves (isobilateral), beardless perianth pieces that sometimes have crests or slender papillae, and exarillate seeds, usually D-shaped to cubical and with corky coating. We prefer to recognize *Limniris* at generic rank considering that Wilson's redefinition of *Iris* (including *Belamcanda* Adans. and *Pardanthopsis* (Hance) L.W. Lenz) makes that group much too heterogeneous and difficult to define. *Limniris* is based on *Iris* sect. *Limniris* Tausch (Hort. Canal. [sine pag.]. 1823), which first grouped only *I. pseudacorus* L. and *I. sibirica* L. The lectotype is *I. sibirica* (L.) Fuss (*Iris sibirica* L.), which was selected by Rodionenko (in Bot. Zhurn. (Moscow & Leningrad) 92: 550. 2007). In its most recent concept, *Limniris* is composed of about 45 species, widely distributed in the Northern Hemisphere (cf. Rodionenko in l.c.: 547–554. 2007). One of those species is *Iris pseudacorus* L., the original type of *Pseudo-iris* Medik., an earlier generic name that consequently challenges *Limniris* as noted above and recently pointed out by Mavrodiev (l.c.). Note also that although *Limniris* definitely included the type of *Pseudo-iris* when published, it is nonetheless legitimate owing to the legitimacy of its basionym (Art. 52.3), as there is no requirement for Tausch to have adopted *Pseudo-iris* at sectional rank.

Conservation of *Pseudiris* against *Pseudo-iris* as proposed here would be the most convenient solution, since it would favour nomenclatural stability as enunciated in the *Vienna Code*. This presupposes that these names are to be treated as homonyms under Art. 53.3. so that the need to rename *Pseudiris* would be avoided. Moreover, if *Pseudiris* were conserved against *Pseudo-iris* (which would accordingly be rejected), then this would leave the latter no longer available for use (Art. 14.6, last clause). This would end the current threat to *Limniris*, and avoid the need for 45 new combinations to be proposed under *Pseudo-iris*. Therefore, we formally propose to conserve *Pseudiris* Chukr & A. Gil under Art. 14.1–2 against the almost forgotten *Pseudo-iris* Medik., to avoid disadvantageous nomenclatural changes and to best serve stability of nomenclature.

Should, however, this proposal not be recommended, perhaps because *Pseudiris* and *Pseudo-iris* are considered not sufficiently alike to be confused, we would, for the reasons set out above and because *Limniris* is being accepted in the forthcoming account of *Iridaceae* for *Flora Iberica* vol. 20 (<http://www.floraiberica.es/floraiberica/>

texto/imprenta/tomoXX/20_185_00_IRIDACEAE.pdf), propose, as an alternative, conservation of *Limniris* against *Pseudo-iris*:

Limniris (Tausch) Rchb., Deut. Bot. Herb.-Buch: 43. Jul 1841 (*Iris* sect. *Limniris* Tausch, Hort. Canal. [sine pag.]. 1823) [*Monocot.: Irid.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *L. sibirica* (L.) Fuss (*Iris sibirica* L.).

(=) *Pseudo-iris* Medik. in Hist. & Commentat. Acad. Elect. Sci. Theod.-Palat. 6: 417. Apr-Jun 1790, nom. rej. prop.

Typus: *P. palustris* Medik., nom. illeg. (*Iris pseudacorus* L.).

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Prof. John McNeill (Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh) for interesting discussion and nomenclatural advice. This research was partly supported by *Flora iberica* project, parts VIII & IX (CGL2008-02982-C03 and CGL2011-28613-C03-01), from the Spanish Government.

(2074) Proposal to conserve the name *Hoya mitrata* against *H. wallichiana* (*Apocynaceae*, *Asclepiadoideae*)

Michele Rodda

Herbarium, Singapore Botanic Gardens, 1 Cluny Road, Singapore 259569; rodda.michele@gmail.com

(2074) ***Hoya mitrata*** Kerr in Hooker's Icon. Pl. 35: t. 3406. 1940, nom. cons. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): Thailand, Surat, Ban Tong Tao, Kerr 13152 (K)

(=) *Hoya wallichiana* Decne. in Candolle, Prodr. 8: 635. Mar. 1844, nom. rej. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): [Malaysia, Penang] "*Hoya Wallichiana* Dne in DC. Prodr. *Hoya coronaria* Bl. (d'apres Hooker Fl. of British India IV 58)" (P)

Hoya mitrata Kerr. is a species distributed in Thailand, peninsular Malaysia, Sumatra and Borneo. It is an epiphytic twining climber with dimorphic foliage. The first leaf type is broadly ovate with a cuneate-cordate base and a mucronate tip, mostly occurring along climbing stems; the second type is elongate-lanceolate and convex, and occurs on portions of the stem with very short internodes, forming a multi-layered domatium where ant nests are hosted.

Its flowers are borne on negatively geotropic umbels and have a strongly reflexed corolla and a corona composed of abruptly elevated lobes surrounding a depressed stigma, similar to those of the Philippine endemic *Hoya darwinii* Loher.

Hoya mitrata has consistently been accepted and used in the taxonomic literature from its publication in 1940, e.g., by Craib (Fl. Siam. 3: 39. 1951), Anderson (in Gard. Bull. Singapore 20: 191. 1963), and Rintz (in Malayan Nat. J. 30: 498. 1978).

The name is also commonly used in horticultural and popular publications (e.g., in Wennstrom & Stenman, The Genus *Hoya*, 2008; Green in Fraterna 4(4): 8–9. 1991; Green in Fraterna 16(2): 5–9. 2003; Lamb in Gardenwise 20: 3–5. 2003), in the trade and by hobbyists

worldwide since *H. mitrata* is one of the most showy and sought after species in the horticulturally important genus *Hoya*.

In preparation for a revision of *Hoya* of peninsular Malaysia it was realised that Decaisne published the name *Hoya wallichiana* Decne. based on a specimen claimed to be mixed with *Wallich 8165*, the type specimen of *Hoya macrophylla* Wight, a specimen collected from Penang. Shortly after its publication Hooker (Fl. Brit. India 4: 62. 1883) listed *H. wallichiana* among the "doubtful and excluded species" suggesting it may be a synonym of *Hoya coronaria* Bl. The name has not appeared in subsequent treatments. The examination of duplicates of *Wallich 8165* revealed that those at K-W, CAM and E are also mixed and despite being all sterile present leaves clearly belonging to two taxa, some broadly ovate, with often cordate base and acute apex, trinerved, in accordance with the description of *H. macrophylla*, others ovate with cuneate-cordate base, mucronate tip, penninerved, in accordance with those on the *H. wallichiana* type specimen in P. The type specimen of *H. macrophylla* at K is also a mixed gathering: its leaves are all trinerved while the enclosed detached flowers and the drawing in Wight's handwriting belong to a taxon described more than a century later: *H. mitrata*.

It became clear that *H. macrophylla* was described based on a mixed specimen bearing flowers and leaves of different species. The sterile leaves could well belong to the species to which the name is currently applied, e.g., by Rintz (in Malayan Nat. J. 30(3/4): 498. 1978) and can be a suitable lectotype. Additionally, for resolving its doubtful application an epitype needs to be selected (Rodda, in prep.).

In summary, *H. macrophylla* was described by Wight based on a specimen bearing leaves of one species (*H. macrophylla*) and flowers of a different taxon (now known as *H. mitrata*). Sterile specimens bearing leaves of both taxa were distributed. Decaisne separated the